

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. AMENDMENT

Please make the following amendments:

In the Claims

Please cancel claims 11 and 28, without prejudice or disclaimer.

{ Please amend claims 1, 7, 12, and 43 as follows:

C1 1. (Thrice Amended) A method for inhibiting cancer cell growth or killing cancer cells comprising eliciting a lipid specific antibody response with an immunologically effective amount of a composition comprising a phosphatidylserine / polypeptide conjugate.

C2 7. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said lipid specific antibody response is elicited with phosphatidylserine/polypeptide conjugate comprising a polypeptide selected from the group consisting of BSA, KLH, BGG, diphtheria toxin, and β 2-glycoprotein I.

GN C3 11/12. (Twice Amended) A method of generating a lipid specific antibody response, comprising administering to an animal a pharmaceutical composition comprising an immunologically effective amount of a phosphatidylserine/polypeptide conjugate composition.

C4 21/43. (Amended) The method of claim 11/12, wherein said lipid specific antibody response is elicited with a phosphatidylserine/polypeptide conjugate comprising a polypeptide selected from the group consisting of BSA, KLH, BGG, diphtheria toxin, and β 2-glycoprotein I.

II. RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

A. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8, 11, 12, and 28-44 were pending at the time of the present Action. Claims 11 and 28 have been canceled and claims 1, 7, 12 and 43 have been amended in the amendment contained herein. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, for example at page 4 lines 20 and page page 6, line 23, *et seq.* Therefore, claims 1-8, 12, and 29-44 are currently pending.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Appendix A is attached hereto containing a marked-up version of the claim amendments made herein, and Appendix B is attached hereto containing a clean copy of all the pending claims.

B. Summary of the Interview with the Examiner Nickol

On February 8, 2001, Applicant's representative, Stephen M. Hash, conducted an interview with Examiner Nickol. All of the pending rejections were discussed. During the course of the interview, Examiner Nickol represented that he felt that the amendments submitted herewith were adequate to place the application in condition for allowance. This is confirmed by the Interview Summary Record dated February 8, 2001, provided by the Examiner.

Examiner Nickol is thanked for his assistance in this regard.

C. The Pending Rejections are Overcome

The Action rejects claims 1-7, 11-12 and 28-43 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 102 and/or 103. These rejections were discussed in the Examiner interview summarized above.